

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for a very thorough and careful examination of the present application. Claims 1, 10, 15, and 20 have been amended in view of what the Examiner indicated was allowable subject matter in the most recent Office action.

Claim 1 has been rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Walsh in view of Tyler. Claim 1 has now been amended to add the limitation that the nose chamber has a diameter of less than 1 inch. This limitation was formerly found in claim 10, which the Examiner indicated was allowable. For this reason, claim 1 as presently amended is now believed to be allowable.

Claim 1 has further been amended to remove the limitation "said nose chamber having an exhaust hole adapted for the passage of an exhaust tube therethrough in a base of said nose chamber, said exhaust hole being substantially offset from the center of said base of said nose chamber." This limitation has been moved to claim 10, where the limitation was originally found. Claim 10 has also been amended to remove the limitation that the nose chamber has a diameter of less than 1 inch. As previously noted, this limitation has been added to claim 1.

The Examiner has rejected claim 15 under Section 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Zalar et al. in view of Bishop et al. Claim 15 has been amended to require that the slot, which corresponds to the nose chamber of claim 1, has a minor dimension of less than 1 inch. As the Examiner has indicated that this limitation was the basis of allowability for claim 10 (limitation now found in claim 1), it is believed that the rejection of claim 15 has been overcome, and it is believed claim 15 as amended is allowable as well.

Claim 20 has also been rejected under Section 103(a) over Ooms. Claim 20 has been amended to specify that the chamber, analogous to the "nose chamber" in claim 1, has a diameter of less than one inch. As the Examiner has indicated that this limitation defines allowable subject matter in claim 10, it is believed that claim 20 as amended is also now allowable.

For these reasons, it is believed that claims 1, 15 and 20 are in condition for allowance. All remaining claims are dependent claims and should thus also be allowable.

Appl. No. 09,710,675
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2003
Reply to Office action of April 09, 2003

Therefore, all of the all claims being in condition for allowance, early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees required by this communication, please charge any such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 32576 (LD11288).

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Brian Alan Bargmeyer, Reg. No. 47,404

526 Superior Avenue East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 30, 2003